

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARD
Meeting Report

Date/Place—February 20, 2003/WSBE Channel 36, Providence

Members/Representatives Present—Howard Boksenbaum, OLIS—RIDOA (Acting Chair); Ellen Alexander, DOC; Gary Ciminero, RI House Policy; Maggie Dziadkiewicz, OHE; Janet Levesque, RILOCAT; Dexter Merry, Public Telecommunications Authority; Joseph Pomposelli, DLT; Bruce Reirden, Care New England; Christopher Wessells, URI

Members/Representatives Absent—Stephen Alves, RI Senate; Rosemary Booth Gallogly, Budget Office—RIDOA; Nicholas Leporacci, MHRH; Raymond McKay, City of Warwick; Peter McWalters, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; James R. Monti, Jr., West Warwick School District; Joan Ress Reeves, Library Board of RI; James Willis, Secretary of State's Office; Don Wolfe, Member-at-Large

Other Attendees—Warren Angell and Pamela Annarummo, RI DEM; Carol Ciotola, Recording Secretary, OLIS—RIDOA

Approval of January 23, 2003, Meeting Report—The January 23, 2003, Meeting Report, was approved as presented by unanimous consent.

Chair's Report—Mr. Boksenbaum reported that New York State's Computer Security Operation called a meeting of all states on January 30—eleven states were represented. Its purpose was to create a State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC), particularly regarding the question of security. In the past the focus had been primarily on critical infrastructure systems (i.e., power plants, TV stations, water resources, etc.). The National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) last year recognized the need to create a cyber ISAC as well; and there was a strong feeling among federal homeland security agencies to halt the separation of cyber and physical infrastructures. To date, 14 states have been brought together to share information. He was asked by EMA to serve as one of the state's points of contact for this ISAC. Future meetings will be handled through teleconferencing; and, in fact, the first teleconference meeting was held just prior to this meeting. His concern that Rhode Island does not have a disaster recovery site or a disaster plan mirrored those of other states. There is also the need to organize an ISAC within Rhode Island; in this regard, he plans to reconvene the IRMB's Work Group, which is a collection of information services personnel from all state agencies who met on a regular basis until about a year ago. Since 85 percent of the infrastructure in Rhode Island is not part of state government, he is searching for ways to pursue an internal Rhode Island sharing operation to include the state's counterparts in the private sector. He plans to discuss this effort with the Rhode Island Technology Council (RITEC), which is an organization that offers educational opportunities in the information technology area. He will report back to this Board once he has coordinated efforts with RITEC.

- Mr. Wessells remarked that RITEC is an outstanding organization. In fact, that is how URI was able to provide professional development training for its technical staff. It is an inexpensive way to obtain cutting edge technical training and advice.
- In Mr. Reirden's words, "RITEC is it." He explained that it serves as a human networking system—resulting in the ability to get to know people, and to learn the technology and how to solve technical problems.
- Mr. Boksenbaum announced that RITEC has offered this Board the opportunity to take advantage of particular events free of charge, and asked members to inform their staffs.
- Mr. Boksenbaum reiterated his plan to create an ISAC within Rhode Island and asked for suggestions as to how to reach out to the private sector that are dependent on information technology. RITEC will serve as an important element of that effort.

Communications Working Group (CWG) Report—Mr. Boksenbaum explained that the CWG serves the Domestic Preparedness Subcommittee (DPS), which is part of the Governor's Emergency Management Advisory Council (EMAC). He reported that CWG's proposal to improve emergency

radio communications among Rhode Island's first responders had been approved by DPS. This will be accomplished through the purchase of 70 800 MHz base stations, to be located in dispatch centers. A subgroup of the CWG is working with EMA, the Fire Chiefs' and Police Chiefs' Associations to develop protocol for using this equipment. The State Police granted permission for this radio system to be used as an alert system to refer first responders to the Rhode Island Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (RILETS). Managed by the State Police, RILETS is very restrictive and does not usually allow non-law enforcement officials to use it. He explained that the Civil Defense State Radio System (CDSTARS) would also be activated; however, this system is very old, and the CWG is looking to replace point-to-point radios. Mr. Boksenbaum said that when activating CDSTARS, together with the alert radios, it would be simultaneously necessary to avoid public panic. This effort will be funded through bioterrorism funds through the Center for Disease Control (CDC), EMA and the United Way. Mr. Boksenbaum then reported on a second proposal approved by DPS, to hire a consultant to conduct a thorough study of Rhode Island's emergency radio communications. An RFP was issued, and six responses were received. The Radio Subcommittee recommended RCC Communications to the Department of Administration's Division of Purchases.

- Mr. Merry asked where RCC Communications is based. Mr. Boksenbaum stated that RCC has an office in Massachusetts, but it is headquartered in the state of Virginia.

Mr. Boksenbaum presented RCC's proposed tasks, including an assessment of the radio network, to insure that all first responders can communicate with one another, as well as with elected officials such as the Governor Carcieri and General Centracchio. The Governor and the Adjutant General are the decision-makers with respect to public information. Part of that work has been completed—an inventory of first responders for each agency involved and a preliminary assessment of all data connections in the state. This document has been submitted to the Governor's EMAC and DPS. A proposal has also been submitted to DPS to insure that the contact list is kept up to date, since it names those people who are considered to be critical nodes in the emergency network. This goal is being driven by bioterrorism. CDC standards are being developed, and the private data communications network will be reviewed in an effort to interconnect all of the nodes; CDC is looking for an alternative to using the commercial Internet. The next step will be to assess the functional use of telecommunications equipment, possibly adding data to it at the same time. The New England National Communicable Diseases Data System, LIFESPAN and the Department of Health labs are using the same software. An experiment might be undertaken to learn whether data communications could be done in real time. The CWG will also reach out to OSHEAN and URI, since it will be important to determine the bandwidth needed. This effort will also form the beginnings of a strategy for building out the technology network. He noted the need to develop a stream of funding to insure that the system once built can be maintained. As a first step, all agencies have been asked to define what critical nodes mean to them. Using this term, responses will be cataloged. Regarding radio communications, at the next CWG meeting members will receive a presentation from Booz Allen Hamilton. This firm holds the federal contract to insure interoperability in wireless communication efforts. The CWG provided Booz Allen Hamilton with the responses to the RFP in order to conduct interference studies. The state is committed to 800 MHz radios, for which enforcement divisions have significant capacity. The CWG is looking to Booz Allen Hamilton for advice regarding the FCC with respect to public safety bandwidth.

- Mr. Wessells asked if there would be ongoing costs associated with the network. Mr. Boksenbaum noted two—maintenance and training. For this effort, many funding streams have been forged. The State Police will provide maintenance to this network, and it will be operated under the Department of Transportation's (DOT's) antenna. DOT has adequate capacity, but Mr. Boksenbaum cautioned that expansion is envisioned; thus, DOT might need to determine whether or not it could accommodate this system at that point.
- Mr. Wessells asked how deliverables from RCC would be handled. Mr. Boksenbaum replied that the RFP has an option to develop a marketing plan to potential funding agencies.

Portal Review Committee Report—Mr. Boksenbaum noted that this Committee has not met yet this month. He distributed a copy of the General Manager’s report for members’ review. In Ms. Gammon’s absence, he announced that by the end of this week, citizens would be able to renew vehicle registrations online. Arrangements with the Governor had been made for a ribbon-cutting ceremony; unfortunately, scheduling changes prevented the Governor from participating. Thus, it was decided that launching would be modified with a soft rollout now and a big public relations effort later. He termed this service a watershed application for DMV in terms of application development. Vanity plates and plate purchase are coming, as are original vehicle registrations through dealerships. Since the DMV database is now in place, it will be easy to build onto the front end for future services.

- Mr. Angell commented on the Commercial Marine License Renewals service, which is seasonal. It will probably be presented at a press conference. Ms. Annarummo added that the license process changed this year, and it appears that many fishers chose to make payments in person to avoid any problems. She indicated that next year, this service will be given an enhanced public relations effort.
- Mr. Angell noted that there were 10,000 hits to the Individual Sewage Disposal System (ISDS) Status service. DEM plans to provide a second phase of this service, which would be fee-based.

Mr. Boksenbaum noted that with respect to contract compliance, the State contract with NEI includes a written requirement for NEI’s network revenue account to be pledged to the State. To date, this part of the contract has not been fulfilled, though, a sales representative from Citizens Bank is researching this matter to determine what bank instrument could be modified to fulfill that part of the contract. He explained that FCC regulations changed between the time the contract was signed and the time that NEI went to its bank to establish that account. At that time NEI learned that this type of account could no longer be established. In an attempt to safeguard the State’s interest in the revenue account, Mr. Boksenbaum requested permission from the Board to ask the Department of Administration’s Bureau of Audits to conduct an audit from the State’s perspective. Price-Waterhouse just completed NEI’s independent audit as required by the contract.

- Mr. Reirden asked if Price-Waterhouse’s audit was NEI’s standard financial audit, to which Mr. Boksenbaum replied that it is. He added that under contract requirements, the State will receive a copy of that audit. The audit he is requesting would be to determine whether NEI’s contract with the State is being complied with and whether the State has the appropriate protections and safeguards in place.

Mr. Boksenbaum then pointed to another element of the contract that has yet to be resolved—source code escrow. The State is now one and one-half years into the contract, yet this item has not been resolved. This further points to the need for an audit to document those places in the contract where work needs to be done in terms of contract performance and compliance.

Mr. Reirden moved to: Request the Bureau of Audits to conduct an audit on the Rhode Island State Portal. Mr. Wessells seconded the motion.

- Mr. Wessells felt it would be prudent of the Board to conduct such an audit, given that so many technical organizations in general have gotten into a lot of trouble recently.
- Mr. Ciminero asked for further information about the escrow source code. Mr. Boksenbaum explained that it is an established computer code that would allow a third party to carry on NEI’s business, should it go bankrupt. The State would not receive the code unless that were to actually occur. Implementation of the source code is schedule to occur soon. Agreement has been reached; and an escrow company is being sought.

The motion was approved unanimously. Mr. Boksenbaum will prepare a memo to Stephen Cooper, Chief of the Bureau of Audits, to request that an audit be conducted for the Rhode Island State Portal.

Old Business: Chief Information Officer’s Job Description—Mr. Reirden referred to Bill S 0231, legislation that would establish a State Department of Information Technology. He then distributed a revised version of the job description that he had initially drafted, as well as an article from Gartner with respect to creating a public-sector Chief Information Officer (CIO) job description. He reviewed this revision, which was based on his review of Rhode Island General Laws 29-3.1-23 and 42-11-1 and 2, together with strong input from Ms. Levesque.

- With respect to “Powers and Functions of the Chief Information Officer,” Mr. Boksenbaum noted that early on the IRMB had made a strong statement about the need to move quickly to fill this position. Now that the Board is operating within a new administration, it might be better to recommend a new approach, rather than to follow the existing track.
- Mr. Reirden stated that if the State wants to have cost-effective computing, increased reliability, reduced costs and enterprise-wide standards, it might be appropriate to have separate computing organizations.
- Mr. Wessells cited an example to support the need for separate computer organizations. URI has a fairly robust student population; and their tuitions bring in more than 50 percent of the college’s revenues. For this reason, URI must deliver the highest level of technology possible.
- Ms. Alexander also cited examples to support the need for separate computer organizations. The Department of Corrections’ (DOC’s) public safety operations and security needs vastly differ from those of other departments. Also, the Department of Transportation (DOT) and its federal relationship require a 16-month calendar; DOT needs a system to handle that.
- With respect to a standardized enterprise-wide application, Mr. Reirden said that if the State chooses to develop rather than to purchase core applications with help desk functions, the project management would fall to the CIO to insure that all standards exist. It would not necessarily mean that different computing capabilities are needed, but that some of the core functions could be brought together in a cost-effective way. Mr. Boksenbaum added that though coordination of those functions may not at first appear to fit into the core, commonalties might later be identified. Mr. Wessells explained that there are certain technology needs at URI that must be addressed that are unlike any other agency’s, such as achieving accreditation. He is not aware of any research institution that does not have its own CIO to manage these very complex organizations. He stressed the importance of having URI maintain its independence to meet accreditation standards and to follow through on all laws of the Department of Education’s boards and commissions. He announced that URI would be opposing many aspects of Bill S-0231.

Mr. Wessells felt that the State is at a turning point as technology moves forward in the next five to ten years. With a new administration he felt that a CIO should solely focus on technology, with a spin-off of the Library Services unit. He then distributed and reviewed a rough draft of a Chief Technology Officer’s (CTO’s) job description for Board consideration, developed by Dean Gandel and himself. Since the state has so much work to do in terms of infrastructure and coordination in the area of ERP application, especially if the state moves forward with ORACLE applications, he felt that the CTO would need to focus on that work. With respect to Library Services, some of the big areas of library work would be coordination of resource sharing and work on consortium agreements, as well as electronic resources. He noted that this draft is much more technically oriented than Mr. Reirden’s and focuses more on infrastructure issues. They wanted the Board to think more about the Rhode Island factor and whether or not it makes sense to separate Library Services and Information Technology. He reviewed the CTO’s duties and responsibilities and commented on position requirements. He asked members to provide feedback, which could result in the melding of the two draft job descriptions.

- Mr. Reirden’s initial reaction was that Mr. Wessells and Dean Gandel did a good job at compiling a job description for a CTO. He noted, however, that there is a difference between these two positions. A CIO is generally responsible for developing strategy and relationship building, and all that goes on with governance of funding relationships and global strategy. A CTO is one that gets closer to the technology. He didn’t see any reason why the state could not have both a CTO and a CIO, since this often occurs in larger corporations. The legislation before the Senate refers to a CIO. Whether or not a CIO could then request a CTO position is not certain.
- Mr. Wessells said it was more a matter of semantics. He wants to insure that there is a separation between Library Services and Information Technology. Mr. Reirden pointed out that Library Services does have a different core message with a different constituency. However, after an earlier conversation with Mr. Boksenbaum, he felt that it might be possible for Library Services to benefit from Information Technology by using that technology and funding to build on the infrastructure and

to provide more access to relevant data and information. Though Mr. Wessells could appreciate the perspective presented, he expressed his and Dean Gandel's concern that if one person oversees everything, that person would have to be an expert in all areas. Mr. Reirden pointed out that he oversees 100 people. In most cases they have specific technology expertise. He hires them for their expertise. As a CIO, he tells them what he expects, and they provide the expertise to get the job done. Mr. Wessells felt that the Director of Library Services should be at the same level as the CIO and should be able to discuss critical issues with the Director of Administration.

- Ms. Levesque noted that years ago there had been a Director of the Department of State Library Services, and she was uncertain as to whether this administration would be willing to establish a separate department again, since the momentum currently is to streamline efforts. Mr. Wessells was unaware of how many staff formed Library Services. Mr. Boksenbaum replied there were 22 on staff, then emphasized that it would absolutely not be a good idea to create another department, because it would look as though government was growing. This administration has answered that question, in that it intends to meld like functions together. He recognized a synergy in this approach provided the state has the right people in leadership roles, such as the CIO, Director of Library Services, CTO and Telecommunications Director. He disagreed that Library Services' consortium agreements would drain the CIO's capabilities. This would no more occur than agreements with Verizon would. There is considerable diversity among states; for example, in New Jersey and Wyoming Information Technology is part of the Governor's operation, though located in Administration or General Services. If the aim were to strictly have a technology person as a CIO, then the policy side, as well as other pieces, would be missed.
- Mr. Wessells again stated that it is a matter of semantics. He felt that since Rhode Island has had such a difficult time in securing funds for information technology, a different approach should be taken—have a CTO who would focus on technology and put Library Services in another area. Mr. Boksenbaum did not feel that Library Services was such a big piece of the issue. To a large extent, lack of funding, staffing and training are issues that have surfaced with respect to Information Technology. Mr. Reirden cited the global issue of having the administration and the highest level of executive management aware of the value of information technology. A CIO would fight for the funding to support Information Technology, and demonstrate through practice that the organization delivers on values gained. He viewed the CIO as heading that effort. He agreed that the CIO could not do it alone. Key technology functions are necessary to build a powerful organization, and what needs to happen irregardless of the CIO's job description is that the backing needs to be there from the state. He felt it absolutely essential to have a CTO, together with a CIO, and a Director of Library Services to build a technology team. Mr. Wessells noted that at URI there is a CIO and a library team with four key unit directors who are experts in those areas. He felt it would be an impossible task for a CIO to undertake all of this work. Mr. Boksenbaum noted that OLIS has a staff of 137 and recognizes the need to reconfigure the structure.
- Mr. Reirden said that if the Board feels that Library Services needs to be brought out of OLIS, he would make that change. Mr. Boksenbaum argued, however, that the issue has become more than just the job description and did not feel that the Board should any take action at this time. Consideration of who the CIO should report to needs to be clarified. It is clear to this Board that Information Technology needs a seat at the Governor's table, and that the CIO needs to be present when planning the business side of the organization. There must also be CIO participation with respect to discussion of enterprise-wide priorities. He noted that the Department of Health Director is under contract to the state. This was done to insure that someone with specific technical skills and knowledge was chosen, rather than leaving it to politics. Mr. Wessells stated that contracts are used in the Office of Higher Education as well, noting that if the CIO does not deliver, then he/she should be fired. Mr. Boksenbaum said that this could be stipulated in a contract. Mr. Wessells was not comfortable filling this position via a contract, to which Mr. Boksenbaum explained that he was not advocating for this approach but merely providing information about it.

- Mr. Ciminero after a cursory view of the legislation surmised that it was created outside of Rhode Island. Ms. Alexander noted that it had been modeled from Connecticut legislation passed in 1997. Mr. Reirden suggested tabling discussion on the job description to discuss the legislation. Mr. Boksenbaum noted that two things surfaced from this discussion relevant to the job description. There are two different positions being presented—CIO/CTO, the second of which is a much more focused position, which refers to the Department of Administration (DOA). It is an incredible product that implies a different structure. Mr. Wessells said that the language in his job description would need to be changed, because he thought that DOA covered all state agencies.
 - Mr. Merry asked where the job description would be sent once finalized. Mr. Wessells said that since the Governor needs to make a decision as to structure, this Board should provide him with its advice. Mr. Boksenbaum said that after having written to the former Director of Administration saying that the CIO's position should be filled quickly, the Board then requested review of the current job description. Upon learning that there was no formal job description, the Board decided to draft one. This position was not filled, and the new administration intends to reorganize state government. He felt that the Transition Team should receive the Board's input. He noted that he had invited Howard Edels to attend a Board meeting, but he declined. He does not feel, however, that the Board has wasted its time considering information technology over the past five years.
 - Ms. Annarummo asked if this Board was the arena in which to provide input on restructuring. She felt the Board should discuss what the structure should look like independent of the existing structure and what needs to be addressed in addition to the need for a CIO. She felt it should go beyond advice about the CIO's position and provide input on the agency's mandate and how it should be staffed to carry out its duties, rather than to wait for legislation to dictate it. Mr. Reirden agreed that the job description is only one piece.
 - Mr. Pomposelli said that this Board must first decide whether or not to advise that this be a cabinet-level position that reports to the Governor or a Director.
 - Mr. Ciminero suggested that the Board see how the Transition Teams are progressing. If they are made up exclusively of private-sector people, he was not sure they would understand the rich context of state issues. He asked how the Transition Team is being informed of this level of discussion. Mr. Boksenbaum reiterated that Mr. Edels was invited but had declined to attend a Board meeting, though Information Technology management staff spent several hours being interviewed by a subsection of the Transition Team. He, too, had spent time with Mr. Edels who had requested information relating to Information Technology's scope and costs. As a member of the Transition Team dealing with educational matters, efforts to integrate services to children is underway, since all whom deal with children's service should be able to access the same data.
 - Mr. Reirden then questioned whether the Transition Team was taking the IRMB seriously or whether team members were going in their own direction. Mr. Pomposelli noted that if the Board recommends increasing the size of government, this administration would walk away. He felt that this Board needs to create a job description and offered to draft a job package for the Governor's consideration. This Board should create a strong position to include all areas discussed and forward this information to the Personnel Director with respect to creating such a position. Mr. Boksenbaum explained that this position is already in place. Mr. Pomposelli suggested then that it be strengthened.
 - Mr. Ciminero stated that this decision will not come from below and acknowledged the frustration of the Board not being heard. Mr. Reirden said that if the Transition Team or the Senate determines what the Department of Information Technology will be, there must be a venue for which these parties are communicating to understand the needs of the state. Mr. Pomposelli suggested that the CIO position have a strong aspect of a department or division with authority much in the same way that the Budget Officer does. It is not a cabinet-level position, but it carries a lot of authority.
- Mr. Boksenbaum asked for recommendations from the Board with respect to Library Services, the pending legislation, etc.
- Mr. Pomposelli felt that the job description would need to be flexible enough to fit in with the resulting structure.

- Mr. Ciminero felt that this Board's recommendations should transcend the job description to include its thoughts on structure, etc. If the new administration is considering changes, this Board should provide advice. Mr. Pomposelli did not feel that this Board should make recommendations with respect to structure.
- Mr. Boksenbaum questioned whether this Board should seek solicitation.
- Mr. Pomposelli said he would draft a job description, with Mr. Reirden's assistance and taking URI's proposed draft into consideration, for submittal to the Department of Administration. In this way, the Board has provided input. The next step would be to determine how best to present it to the Department. Mr. Ciminero thought the Transition Team should receive the Board's recommendations.
- Mr. Pomposelli asked about the funding that is in place for this position. Mr. Boksenbaum explained that the CIO's position is the only funded position in Information Technology. All other Information Technology personnel costs are reliant on a rotary fund. Mr. Pomposelli stated that he would be in touch with Mr. Boksenbaum before preparing anything for Board review.
- Mr. Merry thanked Mr. Reirden for developing the CIO's job description, and the rest of the Board joined in commending him for a job well done.

New Business—None

Next Meeting—Thursday, March 20, at 3 p.m. at the Department of Administration, in Providence. Mr. Boksenbaum expects to have a report from the Portal Review Committee and two new fee structures to review for approval.